

I don't think the Bureau of the Budget is properly geared for it. I understand they have 10,000 plus or minus questionnaires down there somebody is reviewing.

Mr. KRUEGER. It is a matter of record, as a matter of fact, in the hearings before the Supreme Court, in the case which Mr. Bowman referred to this morning, and it is in the decision of the Supreme Court where they took note of the concern of the Bureau of the Budget with this very problem.

Mr. GALLAGHER. I know you are concerned. The problem is I don't know whether this is where the jurisdiction rightfully belongs—to have everybody in the Government dump their problem into your lap and hope you will have the personnel to properly review it.

(Brief recess.)

Mr. GALLAGHER. The committee will come to order.

Mr. Rosenthal, being farther down the alphabet, will be here in a minute. If we could resume, it is your recommendations, in which we agree, that the safeguards that you have outlined here this afternoon be built into any program that will come forward as a result of the proposal?

Mr. DUNN. Very definitely. I would amend your statement only to say safeguards of this type, and to emphasize that we need in the process of designing such a program or system before its recommendation for implementation, to undertake staff studies which will pin down much more precisely the legal safeguards and modifications that might be desirable and required, and so forth.

Mr. GALLAGHER. What do you think of the proposal that I advanced on behalf of the committee this morning, of submitting your proposal to a further study with regard to the question of privacy and adequate safeguards?

Mr. DUNN. I think this would be a very productive effort, particularly insofar as the design of the legal protections is concerned and their appropriateness to achieve the objective in law that is desired. I would say, however, there are also some issues of information organization and production of substance here on which people of this type would not have a great deal to offer, and might easily misunderstand or confuse in some way, and would result in legal recommendations that were not effectively addressed to the control that was desired or legal provisions that inadvertently destroyed some essential technical characteristic of an operating statistical system. It seems to me both types have to work together.

Mr. GALLAGHER. We would get some Yale men.

It has been our suggestion that the refining process or the sifting process should be gone through before it becomes a hard proposal; that it go through a further committee which would not necessarily be opposed to the idea, but which would see that adequate legal requirements are built into the system, and that such a second committee of this sort be allowed to look at it from that standpoint.

Mr. DUNN. Are you asking me to recommend—

Mr. GALLAGHER. No. I said would you agree with such a recommendation and that it was necessary?

Mr. DUNN. I would not want in advance to state that one specific way of accomplishing this result or another is preferable, whether another review committee or through some kind of staff procedure or